REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-52 are currently pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 25-26, and 31-36 have been amended, and new claims 43-52 have been added. Support for these claims may be found at least in paragraphs [0023] and [0042]-[0045] of the application. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-25, 27-32 and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas (US 6,304,556) in view of Belcea (US 2002/0080750); and rejects claims 26 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas in view of Juitt (US 7,042,988) and further in view of Belcea. To the extent these rejections remain applicable to the claims, as amended, the Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, as follows.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the ad hoc network comprises a plurality of clusters, *each of the clusters comprising at least two piconets*, each of the piconets comprising at least one intra-cluster bridge terminal, a master terminal, and a member terminal slaved to the master terminal, wherein the *intra-cluster bridge terminal is a member of the two piconets and is configured to form a communications link between the two piconets*" (emphasis added). Independent claims 12, 25-26, and 31-36 recite similar features.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner alleges that Haas, in col. 8, lines 37 to col. 9, line 44, discloses an ad hoc network comprising two clusters and an intra-cluster bridge terminal that is a member of both clusters. The Applicants respectfully submit that Haas fails to disclose an ad hoc network comprising a plurality of clusters, *each of the clusters comprising at least two piconets*, each of the piconets comprising at least one intra-cluster bridge terminal, wherein the *intra-cluster bridge terminal is a member of the two piconets and is configured to form a communications link between the two piconets*, as recited in claims 1, 12, 25-26, and 31-36.

Haas, in col. 8, lines 37 to col. 9, line 63, with reference to Figs. 3 and 4, discloses an ad-hoc network 20 that is comprised of a plurality of nodes 22 that are partitioned into four clusters 24, 26, 28, and 30, where each of the clusters include nodes 22. Each of the clusters, however, does not include any picocells, as recited by claims 1, 12, 25-26, and 31-36. Accordingly, Haas fails to disclose or suggest an ad hoc network comprising a plurality of clusters, *each of the*

clusters comprising at least two piconets, each of the piconets comprising at least one intra-cluster bridge terminal, wherein the *intra-cluster bridge terminal is a member of the two piconets and is configured to form a communications link between the two piconets,* as recited in claims 1, 12, 25-26, and 31-36.

Secondary references Belcea and Juitt, either individually or in combination with Haas, also fail to disclose an ad hoc network comprising a plurality of clusters, *each of the clusters comprising at least two piconets,* each of the piconets comprising at least one intra-cluster bridge terminal, wherein the *intra-cluster bridge terminal is a member of the two piconets and is configured to form a communications link between the two piconets,* as recited in claims 1, 12, 25-26, and 31-36, and as such, fail to make up for the deficiencies of Haas.

In accordance with the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Haas, Belcea, and Juitt, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features recited in claims 1, 12, 25-26, and 31-36.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 12, 25-26, and 31-36 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-11, 13-24, 27-30, and 37-42 depend from claims 1 and 12, respectively, and therefore, also define patentable subject matter, as well as for the additional features recited therein. As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the § 103(a) rejections.

New Claims 43-52

Applicants have added new claims 43-52 to recite subject matter to which they are entitled. As noted above, these new claims are fully supported throughout the Specification.

Additionally, claims 43-52 are allowable, as there is no combination of the cited references that discloses or suggests the subject matter recited by these claims.

In particular, claims 43-52 respectively depend from independent claims 1, 12, 25-26, and 31-36, which are believed to be patentable over any combination of the cited references, as discussed above. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 43-52 are also non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art references.

Further, claims 43-52 recite subject matter not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references. For example, there is no combination of the cited references that discloses or suggests an apparatus, method, or system wherein the route on the ad hoc network

backbone is configured to pass through a first picocell for the first type of call and configured not to pass through the first picocell for the second type of call, as recited in claims 43-52.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claims 43-52.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: ___10|12| 2009___   By: _____

Florin Corie, Reg. No. 46,244
Direct: 858.658.3663

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502